

# **Iowa Teacher Quality Enhancement Grant: Year 2 Final Report**

**September 2008**

**Melissa Brown-Sims  
Matthew Clifford  
Cortney Rowland**

*Submitted to:*  
**Mary Beth Schroeder-Fracek  
Iowa Department of Education  
Grimes State Office Building  
Des Moines, Iowa 50319-0146**



1120 East Diehl Road, Suite 200  
Naperville, IL 60563-1486  
800-356-2735 • 630-649-6500  
[www.learningpt.org](http://www.learningpt.org)

Copyright © 2008 Learning Point Associates. All rights reserved.

2910\_8/08

# Contents

	Page
Introduction and Background .....	1
Evaluation Methods and Reporting Overview.....	3
Evaluation Findings .....	5
Research Question 1: To What Extent Has Iowa Strengthened Teaching in the Content Areas for Those Who Seek to Enter the Profession of Teaching? .....	5
Research Question 2: What Has Iowa Done to Reform Teacher Education Programs to Make Them More Effective Through Rigorous Analysis of Candidates and Program Performance Data?.....	6
Research Question 3: Through Collaboration, to What Extent Is Iowa Meeting Future Challenges to Help New Teachers Meet the Educational Demands for the 21st Century? .....	12
Meeting Federal Program Goals .....	13
Document Review Methods and Findings.....	14
Conclusion and Next Steps .....	20
Next Steps in the Evaluation Process.....	21
References.....	22
Appendices	
Appendix A. Additional State-Level Initiatives Supported by the TQE Grant .....	23
Appendix B. Data Collection Methodology and Sources .....	24
Appendix C. Interview Protocol for Assessment System Awardees From Two and Four-Year Colleges.....	26
Appendix D. Interview Protocol for Dispositions Team Fall 2007 and Spring 2008 Pilots.....	28
Appendix E. Survey Protocol for Students Participating in the Fall 2007 and/or Spring 2008 Dispositions Pilots.....	29
Appendix F. Document Review Rubric.....	34

## **Introduction and Background**

Learning Point Associates (LPA) presents this second annual evaluation report of the Iowa Teacher Quality Enhancement (TQE) grant to the Iowa Department of Education. The purpose of this report is to assess grant implementation and analyze grant activities, outcomes, and progress so that the Iowa Department of Education and TQE grant teams will have useful and timely information for continuous improvement. This report includes information and data on progress and implementation from November 2007 until May 2008.

In spring 2008, the Iowa Department of Education was granted a no-cost extension in order to continue grant implementation efforts through September 2009. The details of this no-cost extension and the implications for evaluation activities are discussed in the Conclusion and Next Steps section of this report.

As stated in previous reports (Brown-Sims, Rowland, & Sexton, 2006; Brown-Sims, Rowland, & Smith, 2007; and Brown-Sims, Rowland, Sexton, & Smith, 2007), the mission of Iowa's TQE program is to reform and enhance the teaching capacities of Iowa's future teachers so that every Iowa child will have access to the highest quality education possible. As the external evaluator of the grant, Learning Point Associates aims to assess Iowa's progress toward achieving its goals and explain changes, if any, to grant implementation.

To achieve its goals, the Iowa Department of Education commissioned eight content-area teams, which pursue processes and outcomes with relative autonomy—the Assessment; Collaborative Plus; Cross-Institutional Articulation; Dispositions; English Language Learners; Language Arts; Middle-Level Content; and Reading and Writing in the Content Areas teams—to collaborate, develop, and disseminate a variety of tools, resources, and other interventions. To help gain the support and insight of key stakeholders, each TQE team includes a variety of constituents, including university faculty, Iowa Department of Education staff, school and district personnel, and other educational leaders with experience and knowledge of teacher preparation within the state. A description of each team's objectives and status updates can be found in the Evaluation Findings section of this report.

The work of these eight teams intends to contribute to four grant goals that are designed to focus on improving various aspects of teacher preparation. Three research questions guide the evaluation of Learning Point Associates, and these research questions are aligned to the grant goals. Table 1 outlines the grant goals, the TQE teams that contribute to each goal, and the respective research question that addresses the grant goal. The fourth grant goal focuses on improving instructional quality around and increasing the use of technology for English language learners (ELLs). This grant goal is not discussed in this report because the University of Iowa evaluates the work of that goal through the efforts of the English Language Learner team. Therefore, the Learning Point Associates evaluation focuses on only seven of the eight grant teams mentioned earlier.

**Table 1. Iowa TQE Grant Goals, TQE Teams, and Corresponding Evaluation Questions**

<b>Grant Goals</b>	<b>TQE Teams</b>	<b>Evaluation Questions</b>
Strengthen Teaching in the Content Areas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Language Arts Team</li><li>• Middle-Level Content Team</li><li>• Reading and Writing in the Content Areas Team</li></ul>	To what extent has Iowa strengthened teaching in the content areas for those who seek to enter the profession of teaching?
Reform Improvement Through Analysis	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Assessment Team</li><li>• Dispositions Team</li><li>• Cross-Institutional Articulation Team</li></ul>	What has Iowa done to reform teacher education programs to make them more effective through rigorous analysis of candidates and program performance data?
Meeting Future Challenges Through Collaboration	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Collaborative Plus Team</li></ul>	Through collaboration, to what extent is Iowa meeting future challenges to help new teachers meet the educational demands for the 21st century?

The Iowa Department of Education works on several other initiatives that are supported by the TQE grant and further contribute to meeting grant goals. However, these state-level initiatives are not a part of the Learning Point Associates evaluation. A description of these initiatives can be found in Appendix A.

This report is organized in four parts. The first section provides an overview of the evaluation methods and reporting. The second part presents team updates and evaluation findings which are organized according to the three research questions. That section also includes a discussion of federal program goals and the document review analysis. The report ends with a conclusion and a discussion of next steps in the evaluation process.

## Evaluation Methods and Reporting Overview

Learning Point Associates addresses the evaluation questions using primarily qualitative methods. In evaluation, qualitative methods are frequently appropriate for process evaluation, including the examination of organizational adoption of new programs, impact assessment of new programs on belief structures, and explanation of process variation (Patton, 1990). Data for this report were collected during the winter of 2007–08 and the spring of 2008 through document reviews, a survey, and interviews with stakeholders. The evaluation team also used progress monitoring (i.e., update calls and e-mails) to evaluate team activities. Information about the methods used for document reviews can be found in the Document Review Methods and Findings section of this report.

Data collection and reporting corresponds with team activity schedules to provide timely, appropriate feedback. A minimal amount of data is presented in this report because the Learning Point Associates evaluation team conducted interviews, document reviews, and a survey for only the Assessment Team, the Dispositions Team, and the Cross-Institutional Articulation Team. In addition to regularly scheduled interim and final reports, LPA provides TQE teams with ad hoc data collection and reporting in order to respond to the emergent data collection needs of the various Iowa TQE teams. Below are descriptions of the various LPA reports, including already-completed ad hoc reports and upcoming ad hoc, interim, and final reports.

- To provide timely, formative information to facilitate needs-driven planning for future Collaborative Plus activities, Learning Point Associates provided evaluation findings to the Collaborative Plus Team in an ad hoc report delivered in February 2008 (Brown-Sims, Rowland, & Smith, 2008). This report includes findings from a survey conducted after the January 2008 Collaborative Plus Team workshop, “Experts Learning and Sharing: Meeting the Learning Needs of All Students.”
- The Learning Point Associates evaluation team recently delivered a report to the Cross-Institutional Articulation Team that discussed results from a survey of college transfer students as well as interviews with community college advising staff (Max, Brown-Sims, & Rowland, 2008). This report intends to provide the Cross-Institutional Articulation Team with information about the facilitators and barriers to the college student transfer process in Iowa.
- Because the work of the Reading and Writing in the Content Areas Team came to a close this year, the Learning Point Associates evaluation team, in collaboration with the Iowa Department of Education, will develop a short, summative report discussing the work of that team and their overall contributions to grant goal 1. This report will be delivered in November 2008.
- All future formative and summative reports will continue to provide status updates for the TQE teams as well as present key findings from any data collection activities conducted by the evaluation team.
- The final summative report (due in fall 2009 to the Iowa Department of Education) will provide a comprehensive overview and final summary of the TQE grant activities across the grant implementation period.

A detailed description of the data collection methodology for the interviews and the online survey is found in Appendix B. Examples of the protocols used to collect data are found in Appendices C, D, and E. Findings from these data collection efforts can be found in the next section.

## Evaluation Findings

As previously mentioned, this report represents work and data collection efforts since November 2007. Following are status updates for each of the TQE teams as well as findings from some of the data collection efforts. The status updates and findings are organized by research question.

### **Research Question 1: To What Extent Has Iowa Strengthened Teaching in the Content Areas for Those Who Seek to Enter the Profession of Teaching?**

The Middle-Level Content, Language Arts, and Reading and Writing in the Content Areas Teams conduct work that contributes to the first research question. Data were not collected for these teams for this report; therefore, this section will consist only of status updates.

#### **Middle-Level Content Team**

**Status Update.** The work of the Middle-Level Content Team is designed to strengthen core content requirements for middle-level teachers (Grades 5–8). The team has two primary strategies for meeting this goal: 1) the development of a new middle school endorsement; and 2) grant-funded collaborations between districts and universities to create pilot programs for developing research-based models for middle school education or for developing professional development programs to improve teacher education or instruction of practicing teachers. Below is a short status update on the current work of this team.

- **New Middle School Endorsement:** The Middle-Level Content Team contributed to state administrative rule the adoption of a Middle-Level Content Endorsement, which went into effect in January 2008 through an administrative rule (State of Iowa Board of Education Examiners, 2007a). As of April 2008, no Iowa IHEs have been approved to offer curriculum toward the new endorsement. The Middle-Level Content Team has interest in ascertaining the impact of the changed administrative rule on IHE curriculum and for out-of-state teachers.
- **District-University Collaborations:** The Middle-Level Content Team awarded grants to four district-university partnerships to prepare models for new middle-level content programming. The purpose of these partnerships was to develop models of improved teacher education that could be adopted or adapted by other institutions. In spring 2006, approximately \$150,000 was awarded across four collaborative teams of teacher education professionals and middle grades educators. Grantee final reports were due in the fall of 2007—to date, only two grantees have submitted their final reports. The Middle-Level Content Team has been looking for ways in which the four grantees can share the details of their collaborations. The four grantees have plans to share information about this work at the Iowa Association of School Board Conference on November 21, 2008.

#### **Language Arts Team**

**Status Update.** The Language Arts Team aims to strengthen the core content requirements for secondary teachers of language arts. To do this, the team developed an enhanced Language Arts

endorsement that bundles currently existing endorsements (English, Speech, and Journalism) into one broad Language Arts endorsement (State of Iowa Board of Education Examiners, 2007b). Below is a short status update on that strategy.

- **Language Arts Endorsement:** The new endorsement went into effect in January 2008.

### **Reading and Writing in the Content Areas Team**

**Status Update.** The Reading and Writing team proposed three primary strategies to achieve its team goals and objectives of strengthening teaching in reading and writing in the content areas: (1) determine the current state practices in teaching reading and writing in Grades 5–12 content areas and gaps in knowledge and practice; (2) provide resource materials for Grades 5–12 teachers, teacher educators, and teacher candidates to use in increasing and improving teaching reading and writing in specific content areas; and (3) provide opportunities for research-based professional development for teams of IHE content methods instructors and Grades 5–12 teachers in using strategies designed to enhance reading achievement through the content areas. In January 2008, the Reading and Writing team learned that Iowa TQE grant leadership had decided to cease the team efforts and redistribute the team’s funding toward other TQE areas.

### **Research Question 2: What Has Iowa Done to Reform Teacher Education Programs to Make Them More Effective Through Rigorous Analysis of Candidates and Program Performance Data?**

The Assessment, Cross-Institutional Articulation, and Dispositions Teams continue to do work toward this second research question.

#### **Assessment Team**

**Status Update.** The Assessment Team continues to offer grant funds and support to two- and four-year college grantees who aim to improve their institution’s teacher candidate assessment systems. Request for Proposals (RFP) and support services now focus on sustainability and institutionalization of assessment efforts. In February 2008, the team revised their RFP to highlight a focus on sustainability and disseminated it to community colleges and four-year institutions across Iowa. The revised RFP privileges proposals with sustainability plans for post-grant activities. Support to grantees is provided by Assessment Team members and is ongoing. During the past year, the Assessment Team leader conducted 22 consultations at 18 different grantee institutions. In order to continue to provide technical assistance through 2009, the Assessment Team leader attained additional leave from his position at a four-year institution.

Since the May 2008 RFP closing date, the Assessment Team received proposals from 22 institutions. All but one application came from four-year institutions, although the Assessment Team actively sought two year college applications. The Assessment Team announced winners of the fourth-round grant awards in June 2008. Grant awardees for the fourth round include 21 four-year institutions and one community college.



The Assessment Team hopes to convene a meeting at the Iowa Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (IACTE) conference where they will invite all current and former assessment system awardees to engage in a conversation around assessment materials, ideas, and examples of exemplary assessment systems. The Assessment Team is also exploring how to develop a network of grantee institutions that would provide grantee problem-solving services as well as more concentrated support to those institutions in need of additional technological assistance.

**Interview Findings From Assessment System Awardees.** To assess the impact of grant funding and support efforts on the development and sustainability of IHE assessment systems, the evaluation team interviewed four recipients of assessment grant funds. A copy of the interview protocol is found in Appendix C. Three of the institutions applied for and received grant funds twice, while one institution is currently in its first year of grant funding. Findings from the Assessment Team grantee interviews addressed five primary areas: use of funds, facilitators, barriers, sustainability, and results/outcomes. Each of these areas is addressed in more detail below.

- **Use of Funds:** Grantees in their second round of funding mentioned that their work is a continuation of work from the first round of grant funding. For example, one grantee mentioned that the first round of funding was to “discover and build a new system” and that the second round of funding “involved more implementation of that system.” These systems include assessment systems for individual candidate assessment as well as for overall program assessment. Another way that at least two grantees used their funds was to hire consultants or speakers who were experts on the topic of assessment systems and could share knowledge and expertise. Three of the four grantees mentioned that the funds were useful because they make it possible for faculty to work on assessment system efforts outside of their regular duties.
- **Facilitators:** The four interviewees mentioned a variety of factors that serve as facilitators in the process of developing, revising, or implementing their assessment systems using grant funds. As mentioned in the November 2007 interim report, at least two interviewees commented that being able to access time and support from the Assessment Team’s leader was a helpful part of the process. One interviewee mentioned that the team leader’s advisor role helped to push the university to think about what exactly they want to include in their assessment system. Two interviewees mentioned that sessions at IACTE meetings have been helpful in clarifying assessment expectations: Interviewees called it a “good sharing organization” and “a good sounding board.” Two additional factors that interviewees mentioned as facilitators were faculty commitment and flexibility. One interviewee said that having faculty committed to the work of the assessment system was important in moving along the work. Another interviewee commented that what has been helpful to his institution’s work on their assessment system is the flexibility to “make it our own program.”
- **Barriers:** Interviewees also mentioned several barriers to the process of using grant funds to develop or improve their assessment system. Similar to the comments in the November 2007 interim report, interviewees overwhelmingly mentioned time as the number one barrier. For example, grant awardees need a significant amount of time to figure out what should be included, analyze data, understand the technology, and meet.

- **Sustainability:** As previously mentioned, an emerging and important part of this work is the extent to which these efforts will continue once the grant funds are no longer available. Interviewees had a variety of reactions when asked about the sustainability of their work. Several interviewees noted that because the system is now more or less in place and because college faculty, students, or both are using the system, it essentially *has* to be sustained. When asked about the resources needed for sustaining an assessment system, one interviewee said his college is usually “pretty good” about recognizing what is needed and being supportive. Several interviewees also mentioned that it would be easier to sustain the assessment work over time as the work becomes increasingly efficient. For example, in order for a system to be sustainable, it should do two critical things: require little time from faculty and students to manage or complete and assess only the key data related to teacher education students’ progress and achievement. Another important factor for sustainability mentioned by one interviewee is the need to work hand-in-hand and garner the support of the K–12 sector to assist in providing feedback and insight to two- and four-year institutions about what issues are affecting today’s schools. By knowing this information, institutions will be better able to prepare the next wave of future teachers.
- **Results/Outcomes:** Interviewees discussed the various ways they have begun to incorporate the results or outcomes from their assessment system to encourage organization and energy regarding assessment. For example, one grantee mentioned that he could now generate reports on standards and learning outcomes for student teachers to isolate areas that need improvement. Another grantee noted how his institution used its improved assessment system to figure out from student teaching assessments that student teachers were not feeling comfortable with classroom management. The department then used this information to make program adjustments to bolster preparation regarding this perceived weakness.

For the Assessment Team, it is important to note that interviewees continue to mention upfront planning time as a barrier to their work. Grant awardees are clear that it takes a significant amount of time to figure out what should be included, analyze data, understand the technology, and meet. The Assessment Team might consider ways of better communicating with new awardees about how to address these issues, using lessons learned from past grant awardees.

### **Cross-Institutional Articulation Team**

**Status Update.** During the spring 2008 reporting period, the Cross-Institutional Articulation Team has made limited progress toward one of its goals—to develop a Model of Excellence for the Iowa Teacher Education Transfer Articulation agreement. Work toward this initiative was briefly sidelined during fall 2007 by the Leadership Team, but the Cross-Institutional Articulation team hopes to meet soon to gain momentum on this work and determine next steps for the development and implementation of this proposal. The idea for a Model of Excellence agreement is to secure a seamless transition process and high academic standards for teacher education students who earn an Associate of Arts degree and who wish to transfer from a community college to a four-year institution.

Another Cross-Institutional Articulation Team objective is to create a voluntary agreement on the basic competency tests and cut-scores required to enter a teacher education program. The Cross-Institutional Articulation Team finalized a document outlining competency tests and cut-score

requirements across 38 Iowa colleges. The team reported that a statewide dissemination plan was in place for the document however, the plan had not been enacted as of this date. The Cross-Institutional Articulation Team did disseminate the document at the September 2007 IACTE conference and highlighted for conference participants the most common test scores accepted across institutions.

## **Dispositions Team**

**Status Update.** The Dispositions Team completed two pilots of their assessment tool, one in fall 2007 and one in spring 2008. The purpose of the pilots was to test the construct validity of the assessment tool for measuring the presence or absence of certain dispositional qualities of teacher education candidates. The pilots took place at six institutions during the fall 2007 semester and five institutions during the spring 2008 school semester. All but one institution participating in the fall pilot volunteered to continue piloting the tool in the spring semester. The Dispositions Team strongly encouraged all participating faculty members and their students to provide feedback on the strengths and weaknesses of the tool at the end of each pilot. To that end, Learning Point Associates conducted interviews and launched an online survey to gain an in-depth perspective on the pilot, including the effectiveness and comprehensiveness of the assessment tool.

Using feedback from the pilots, the Dispositions Team plans to revise the assessment tool. The team then plans to complete a final version of the tool by summer 2008 and disseminate it to teacher education programs throughout the state, beginning in the fall. The team leaders note that although they cannot require all two- and four-year institutions to use the assessment tool, they will “strongly encourage” its use as well as provide provisional recommendations and guidance for how to use it. For example, the Dispositions Team mentioned that it would encourage community colleges to utilize the tool at least once during an introductory teacher education course and again during a student’s sophomore year. In contrast, four-year institutions might be asked to implement the tool at least four times a year—once during an introductory course, then in a methodology course, then in student teaching, and finally during a student’s field experience.

The Dispositions Team views the assessment tool and supporting documents as potentially beneficial to institutions beyond Iowa’s borders. To generate interest and support on the topic of dispositions and to keep stakeholders abreast of their work, members of the Dispositions Team presented their work at the National Symposium on Teacher Dispositions at Northern Kentucky University in November 2007 and the National Community College Teacher Education Conference in Denver, Colorado, in February 2008.

**Dispositions Team Survey Findings.** The following section highlights some of the key findings from the online survey given to students who participated in the fall 2007 and/or spring 2008 Dispositions pilot. A copy of the survey protocol is found in Appendix E. The majority of survey respondents identified themselves as sophomores (75 percent), followed by freshman and juniors (12 percent each). Most (56 percent) of the survey respondents participated in the fall pilot; the remaining respondents (44 percent) participated in the spring pilot.

When asked to specify which of their courses took part in the pilot, more than three quarters of the respondents (78 percent) stated that the pilot took place during an introductory course. An additional 22 percent noted that the pilot was conducted in a midlevel course, and 11 percent of the respondents mentioned that the assessment tool was piloted in a theory course. (The total is greater than 100 percent because respondents could select more than one answer.) When asked how they applied the assessment tool during the pilot, a majority (89 percent) of the participants used the tool as part of a self-assessment. A much smaller percentage of students used the tool to observe a teacher or professor in their classroom (22 percent) or to observe a peer (11 percent). No respondents stated that they used the assessment tool during their field experience or student teaching. (The total is greater than 100 percent because respondents could select more than one answer.) See Table 2 for results on how the pilot students applied the assessment tool.

**Table 2. Applying the Dispositions Team Assessment Tool**

<b>During the pilot, how did you apply the assessment tool? (<i>Select all that apply.</i>)</b>	<b>Percentage</b>	<b>N</b>
I used the tool as a self-assessment.	89%	8
I used the tool to observe a teacher or professor in the classroom.	22%	2
I used the tool to observe my preservice peer(s).	11%	1
I used the tool during my student teaching.	0%	0
I used the tool during my field experience	0%	0

*Note.* The total is greater than 100 percent because respondents could select more than one answer.

Respondents were asked the frequency with which they used the tool over the course of the pilot. Findings revealed that approximately half of the students used the tool once during the pilot semester, 25 percent used it two times during the semester, and less than one fourth of the survey respondents (24 percent total) used it three to four times throughout the semester.

When it came to understanding the purpose and process for employing the tool, 100 percent of the respondents reported that they received clear instructions as well as a clear description of the purpose of the tool. Perhaps as a result of the unambiguous instructions and rationale given by the faculty regarding the assessment tool, a high percentage of students rated the assessment tool as “very useful” (75 percent) or “moderately useful” (25 percent) as a method for continuous learning. Moreover, 38 percent believed that the assessment tool was “very effective,” and 62 percent of respondents believed it was “effective” when it came to capturing the different ethical and professional behaviors exhibited by teachers.

***Strengths of the Assessment Tool Mentioned in the Survey.*** When asked in open-ended questions to identify major strengths of the assessment tool, survey respondents identified the following assets:

- It provides students with an opportunity to single out areas of strength as well as areas in need of improvement.
- It had easy-to-follow instructions.
- The tool provided thorough definitions of each disposition.

***Weaknesses of the Assessment Tool Mentioned in the Survey.*** Survey respondents also identified several challenges in using the assessment tool:

- Users had difficulty in relating some dispositional qualities and practices as relevant to their current status as teacher education students. For example, many respondents rated these behaviors or qualities as “not applicable.”
- The lack of specific descriptors following each disposition made it hard for students to picture what certain criteria, such as how to exhibit authenticity, may look like in action.

**Dispositions Team Interview Findings.** To get a more in-depth perspective on the Dispositions pilot, the evaluation team interviewed seven faculty members from four institutions across Iowa that participated in the pilot. A copy of the interview protocol is found in Appendix D.

To allow for flexibility in how the assessment tool could be piloted, the Dispositions Team provided few parameters for faculty members who participated in the pilot. Some of the interviewees noted, however, that they often took part in planning meetings with other faculty members at their institution who were participating in the pilot to discuss a method for implementation. All of the respondents reported piloting the tool as a student self-assessment during an introduction to teaching course, which primarily consisted of freshman and sophomore students. For example, one interviewee noted that she required her freshman class to do a self-assessment using the tool and to write a report detailing areas of weakness as well as what steps students could take to improve. Several interview respondents also noted that before the self-assessments took place they discussed at length with their students the purpose, importance, and definitions of each disposition in order to provide more context for the tools and to answer any questions. Two of the faculty members also revealed that they used the assessment tool as part of their students’ field experience.

***Strengths of the Assessment Tool Mentioned in the Interviews.*** When asked to identify strengths of the tools, interview respondents identified the following:

- The assessment tools are comprehensive with respect to the variety of dispositions included.
- The tools used clear and understandable language to describe each disposition.
- The simple rating system incorporated within the tool is easy to use; the inclusion of the “not applicable” and “not observed” ratings allowed users to assess themselves on each disposition.

***Areas for the Assessment Tool to Improve, as Mentioned in the Interviews.*** Interview respondents also were asked to identify weaknesses of the tool as well as ideas for improvement. Interviewees mentioned the following:

- The inclusion of the contextual disposition, which allows institutions to use this category to emphasize and assess components or qualities unique to their mission and purpose, made it difficult for two faculty members to generate specific examples of dispositions that were relevant for their institution. To help address this issue, the Dispositions Team

may consider providing examples of how other colleges and universities, such as faith-based institutions, are incorporating this disposition within their schools.

- One of the respondents interviewed noted the length of the tool. Specifically, the interviewee said that in order to get more usage out of the tool, the Dispositions Team should consider shortening the tool so that it is more user-friendly.
- Two respondents suggested that the Dispositions Team provide specific examples of teachers and students violating a particular disposition. This approach will help students to identify how teachers should *not* display a specific behavior.

Six of the respondents interviewed recommended that the Dispositions Team provide institutions with examples on ways to utilize or incorporate tools beyond the classroom. For example, one respondent suggested that institutions use the assessment tool to collect data on their student teachers over the course of their tenure in the program and to incorporate these data into any assessment system that is in development from their school's Education Department.

As the Dispositions Team revises the conceptual framework and assessment tool, the evaluation team encourages the team to review the findings from the interviews and the online survey of students who participated in the pilot. The results from these two data collection efforts reveal important findings for the Dispositions Team not only in the format/content of the conceptual framework and assessment tool but also in how the two pieces might be used upon implementation in two- and four-year institutions.

### **Research Question 3: Through Collaboration, to What Extent Is Iowa Meeting Future Challenges to Help New Teachers Meet the Educational Demands for the 21st Century?**

The work and activities of the Collaborative Plus Team addresses the third research question. Following is a status update for that team.

#### **Collaborative Plus Team**

**Status Update.** Between the submission of the November 2007 Interim Evaluation report and this report, the Collaborative Plus Team has taken steps to accomplish its team's goal of better preparing all teacher education candidates to successfully teach an increasing diverse PK–12 student population, including ELLs, students with disabilities, gifted and talented students, and at-risk students. To this end, the Collaborative Plus team has convened workshops for teacher preparation faculty and staff.

The Collaborative Plus Team organized and facilitated a two-day workshop entitled, "Experts Learning and Sharing: Meeting the Learning Needs of All Students," on January 10 and 11, 2008. The intended audience was teacher education methods instructors. The purpose of this workshop was to provide an opportunity for participants to review their teacher education programs and courses and develop plans to strengthen them to prepare teachers to meet the learning needs of all students. Detailed information about the workshop is found in the follow-up

Learning Point Associates report (Brown-Sims, Rowland, & Smith, 2008). The Learning Point Associates evaluation team will follow up on these plans in future reports.

In order to help spread the work and activities of this team and to encourage communication, collaboration, and sharing of ideas and materials, the Collaborative Plus Team plans to host a statewide summit in October 2008 that will focus on addressing the needs of all learners. The summit will be a follow-up to the January 2008 workshop, but will expand the diversity of potential attendees to include PK–12 teachers, administrators, and consultants from the Iowa Department of Education, to come together and collaborate on these issues.

## **Meeting Federal Program Goals**

As part of its requirements through the federally funded TQE grant, the state of Iowa must meet several Government Performance and Results Act (GRPA) program goals. The state has aligned the TQE grant goals with the GRPA program goals, and through grant reports submitted to the U.S. Department of Education, the state shows how objectives and outcomes of the individual TQE teams address the federal program goals. The GRPA program goals and matching grant goals are shown in Table 3.

As part of evaluation work, the Learning Point Associates team will support the state of Iowa and the TQE Leadership Team in collecting and reporting on information regarding raising standards, core academic subjects, teacher shortages, and professional development. Learning Point Associates will not collect data on student achievement. Additionally, Learning Point Associates is not evaluating the teams that are contributing to the initial certification and licensure program goal or the technology goal. Data for reporting on these federal program goals will be ready to report in the fall 2009 summative report.

**Table 3. Teacher Quality Enhancement Grant Goals and Government Performance and Results Act (GRPA) Program Goals**

<b>GPRA Program Goal</b>	<b>TQE Grant Goal</b>
Student Achievement	Reform and strengthen skills of new secondary and middle school teachers in the content areas (Reading and Writing in the Content Areas Team and Middle-Level Content Team)
Raising Standards	Reform and improve teacher education programs through rigorous analysis of candidate and program performance data (Cross-Institutional Articulation Team)
Initial Certification and Licensure	Reform and improve teacher education programs through rigorous analysis of candidate and program performance data (IDESTE/Pick Team)
Core Academic Subjects	Reform and strengthen skills of new secondary and middle school teachers in the content areas (Middle-Level Content Team and Language Arts Content Team)
Teacher Shortages	Reform and strengthen skills of new secondary and middle school teachers in the content areas (Middle-Level Content Team and Language Arts Content Team)
Professional Development	To prepare new teachers to support and teach diverse student populations (English Language Learners Team and Reading and Writing in the Content Areas Team)
Technology	To prepare new teachers to support and teach diverse student populations (English Language Learners Team)

## Document Review Methods and Findings

For this Year 2 Final Report, the evaluation team reviewed 11 documents created and disseminated by the Assessment and Cross-Institutional Articulation teams. The remaining teams—the Collaborative Plus, Middle-Level Content, Language Arts, and Dispositions teams and the recently disbanded Reading and Writing in the Content Areas Team—did not provide any new documents to review for this report.

The evaluation team continued to utilize the document review rubric employed in the May 2007 final and November 2007 interim reports. A copy of this rubric is found in Appendix F. The evaluation team used this rubric to evaluate the following documents, listed by TQE team:

### *Assessment Team*

- Fourth-Round RFP for Iowa Community College Performance Assessment System Funds



- Fourth-Round RFP for Iowa Four-Year College/University Performance Assessment System Funds
- Scoring Rubric for Candidate and Unit Assessment
- Technical Assistance Follow-Up Letters submitted to Briar Cliff College, Wartburg College, Cornell College, Central College, Grand View College, Upper Iowa University, and Waldorf College

#### *Cross-Institutional Articulation Team*

- Summary of Teacher Education Program Entrance Exam

These documents were evaluated on eight thematic areas that reflect both the overall grant goals as well as the teams' individual goals:

- Communication
- Establishing partnerships
- Practical and/or feasible implementation
- Strengthening teaching in the content areas
- Reform teacher education programs through analysis of candidates and program performance data
- Raises standards and/or accountability for institutions of higher education, administrators, students, or teachers
- Professional development
- Assessment

Several key criteria or indicators make up each thematic area. Some of the criteria present in the rubric are not relevant for the Cross-Institutional Articulation and Assessment teams and the teams' respective documents. In these cases, criteria were marked as "not applicable" (N/A) and did not apply to the final review score.

To ensure interrater reliability, two members of the evaluation team evaluated each document individually using the rubric, compared results, and worked to obtain consensus on rating scores. In addition, the Learning Point Associates evaluation team compared the overall rating for each of the eight thematic areas to the overall rating from the November 2007 interim report. Specifically, an overall score was derived after tallying the total number of individual points given under each thematic area for each reviewed document. Thus, in order to get an overall rating of "extensive coverage," the documents in our review needed to have received a majority score of "3" for each of the criteria under that specific thematic area. This mean score also was computed for documents reviewed in the November report.

This section begins with a brief description of the criteria that make up the eight thematic areas, followed by a comparison of ratings between the November 2007 report and this report. It concludes with a summary of the quality of the documents that have emerged from the TQE

grant. The summary statement(s) pertaining to document review should be read with caution – the evaluation team is unable to isolate whether or not the teams are improving in these general areas and/or if they are improving in their ability to represent their efforts in documents.

## ***Communication***

**Indicators:** Documents were assessed on the extent to which they addressed five key indicators related to communication. These indicators were:

- Clearly establishing TQE team goals or objectives
- Clearly articulating deadlines
- Clearly stating the purpose of the document
- Clearly stating the goals of the overall TQE grant
- Using language directed at key stakeholders

**2007 Overall Rating:** Extensive Coverage

**Current Overall Rating:** Extensive Coverage

- A review of the current documents revealed that similar to last year's results, documents reviewed for this Year 2 Final Report continue to show extensive coverage regarding communication, providing information on four of the five above-mentioned indicators.

## ***Establishing Partnerships***

**Indicators:** Documents were assessed on three indicators related to specifically establishing or supporting partnerships:

- Clearly identifying key stakeholders as support mechanisms in achieving team goals or objectives
- Stating clearly and precisely the intent, goals, or expectations for the partnership
- Stating precisely if there are any consequences for breaking the contract, agreement, or partnership

**2007 Overall Rating:** Minimal Coverage

**Current Overall Rating:** Extensive Coverage

- For this Year 2 Final Report, documents provided extensive coverage on two of three of the above-mentioned criteria related to establishing partnerships. This rating is an improvement over last year's coverage of this indicator. Documents reviewed for this report all identified the key stakeholders needed to support their team's goals. They also clearly acknowledged the goals and expectations for partnerships.

## ***Practical/Feasible Implementation***

**Indicators:** Documents were assessed on six indicators related to practical or feasible implementation:

- Providing detailed policy background or context
- Giving detailed description of initiatives or activities
- Setting clear guidelines as to how and when details of the document will be implemented
- Establishing guidelines for how to use or implement suggested policies, practices, initiatives, or activities
- Focusing on sound educational research and practice
- Clearly defining a plan to utilize respondent feedback results

**2007 Overall Rating:** Extensive Coverage

**Current Overall Rating:** Minimal Coverage

- Documents reviewed for this report showed minimal coverage on the above-mentioned indicators, which is a decrease from the November 2007 interim report rating. Documents for this report provided little policy background or context, did not establish clear implementation guidelines, did not focus on sound educational research and practice, and did not have a clearly defined plan to utilize feedback results for reviewing and evaluating work.

## ***Strengthen Teaching in the Content Areas***

**Indicators:** Documents were assessed on two indicators related specifically to strengthening teaching in the content areas:

- Clearly defined strategies for building both content knowledge and pedagogical knowledge in mathematics, reading, writing, and science
- Focusing on curriculum alignment with national, state, or district standards or performance indicators

**2007 Overall Rating:** Extensive Coverage

**Current Overall Rating:** Not Applicable

- None of the criteria under this thematic area were deemed applicable to any of the documents reviewed for this report. Specifically, the documents in this current review were from two TQE teams whose goals and objectives do not relate to this thematic area.

## ***Reform Teacher Education Programs Through Analysis of Candidates and Program Performance Data***

**Indicators:** Documents were assessed on four indicators related specifically to reforming teacher education programs through analysis of candidates and performance data:

- Clearly identifying which competencies, practices, courses, policies, or procedures need to be taught, assessed, or monitored
- Stating specific minimum and/or maximum cutoff or acceptance criteria
- Establishing guidelines for reporting data on teacher candidates
- Establishing clear strategies to help in the development of teacher educators

**2007 Overall Rating:** Extensive Coverage

**Current Overall Rating:** Extensive Coverage

- The documents reviewed for this report provided extensive coverage on all of the above indicators. This rating is similar to the rating received during last year's document review. To meet the criteria related to establishing guidelines for reporting data on teacher educators, documents such as the assessment system RFPs, for example, required stakeholders to submit action plans and interim and final reports.

## ***Raises Standards and/or Accountability for Institutions of Higher Education, Administrators, Students, or Teachers***

**Indicator:** Documents were assessed on one indicator related specifically to raising standards or accountability for IHEs, administrators, students, or teachers.

**2007 Overall Rating:** Extensive Coverage

**Current Overall Rating:** Extensive Coverage

- Under this criterion, all the documents reviewed continued to provide extensive coverage regarding this indicator. For example, the technical assistance letters recommend that each institution that has received funding for an assessment system develop an assessment cycle schedule that will allow for faculty to gather data and review it to discuss decisions for improvement.

## ***Professional Development***

**Indicators:** Documents were assessed on three indicators related specifically to establishing or supporting professional development initiatives for student teachers:

- Having components of professional development that are clearly aligned with state and national standards
- Having learning activities that are clearly described and are relevant and rigorous

- Having establishing guidelines or strategies for ensuring that professional development translates into effective classroom strategies

**2007 Overall Rating:** Extensive Coverage

**Current Overall Rating:** Not Applicable

- None of the criteria under this thematic area were deemed applicable to any of the current documents. Specifically, the documents in this current review were from two TQE teams whose goals and objectives did not relate to this thematic area. As a result, the evaluation team provided a rating of “not applicable” to all of the documents.

## ***Assessment***

**Indicators:** Documents were assessed on three indicators related specifically to assessing and tracking the effectiveness of the various initiatives or programs:

- Clearly defined strategies to evaluate and monitor the effectiveness of teacher education programs
- Utilizing various tools to monitor the success of policies, programs, or initiatives
- Using multiple assessments for diagnostic and reteaching purposes

**2007 Overall Rating:** Minimal Coverage

**Current Overall Rating:** Extensive Coverage

- The documents reviewed for this report showed extensive coverage on all of the above indicators. This is an improvement from the rating received during last year’s review. For example, the technical assistance letters strongly encouraged assessment system awardees to survey student teachers, alumni, and principals as a method for evaluating the effectiveness of teacher education programs.

## **Discussion of Document Review**

The review of this year’s documents reveals that some of the TQE teams have showed an overall improvement in developing documents that provide coverage on two of eight thematic issues (with two thematic areas receiving a score of “not applicable”). Specifically, documents in the current review provided quality coverage on the following topics: establishing partnerships, assessment, reforming teacher education programs through analysis of candidates and program performance data, and communication. The only area this year that received a lower rating pertained to the issue of practical/feasible implementation. Although the review for this report only included documents developed by the Assessment and Cross-Institutional Articulation Teams, the remaining teams should continue to strive to include language within their documents that addresses each of the above-mentioned thematic areas.

## Conclusion and Next Steps

This Year 2 Final Report details the Iowa TQE grant's implementation efforts from November 2007 to May 2008. Through the collection and analysis of data via interviews, a survey, progress monitoring, and document reviews, the evaluation team continues to assess the extent to which each TQE team is meeting the larger grant goals and objectives as well as the three research questions.

A review of the findings in this report reveals a couple areas for continued focus, improvement, or both. These include:

- **Sustainability is still paramount.** TQE teams should plan to follow through on the sustainability training and planning they started in June 2008. To help ensure that their work is sustained, each team should consider two important implementation factors: (1) Where will final documents, tools, materials, and/or resources be posted, and how will they be posted?; and (2) How will does the TQE team plan to communicate to stakeholders that documents, tools, materials, or resources are available? Furthermore, TQE teams should ensure that all final documents, tools, materials, or resources provide an overview of the purpose and intended outcomes, clear and concise directions for use (if necessary), and contact information in the event that a user needs technical assistance or needs to follow up in any way.
- **Reduce and centralize dissemination efforts to increase coherence, coordination, and cost-effectiveness.** Teams should consider sharing venues to reach a broad yet critical group of stakeholders for disseminating information about the team's work, information, tools, and resources. The September IACTE meeting and the October 2008 summit are two options. Having a target audience in one place will reduce the need to duplicate time, money, and commitment from all parties involved to host or participate in multiple meetings or conferences.

## Next Steps in the Evaluation Process

In spring 2008, the Iowa Department of Education received notification that it had received a one-year, no-cost extension for the grant. As a result, the grant will now extend into a fourth year and conclude in September 2009. To accommodate this new change, the evaluation team will continue to evaluate the seven TQE teams in their efforts to finish and sustain their work and will report findings in upcoming interim and summative reports. Additionally, Learning Point Associates will complete a summative report detailing the efforts and activities of the Reading and Writing in the Content Areas Team. The evaluation team will continue to use a multimethod approach to gather data that will help assess grant implementation activities, outcomes, and progress. To determine the best data collection methods, the Learning Point Associates evaluation team works closely with each individual TQE team.

Below are specific next steps in the evaluation process for the seven TQE teams.

**Evaluation Plans for the Middle-Level Content, Language Arts, and Reading & Writing Teams.** For the November 2008 interim report (and possibly future reports), the Learning Point Associates evaluation team plans to follow up with out-of-state teachers to learn more about any potential impact of the new Middle School and Language Arts endorsements on teachers as a result of their moving to Iowa from another state. Additionally, the evaluation team will follow-up with IHEs that have begun to make changes to their curriculum in order to offer the new middle school endorsement.

The evaluation team, in collaboration with the grant director, plan to develop a short, *summative* report detailing the work of the Reading and Writing in the Content Areas Team as well as the extent to which the team's strategies contributed to grant goal 1. This report will be delivered in November 2008.

**Evaluation Plans for the Assessment, Cross-Institutional Articulation, and Dispositions Teams.** For the November 2008 report, the evaluation team plans to conduct document reviews on finalized documents submitted by the Dispositions, Cross-Institutional Articulation, and Assessment teams. Additionally, Learning Point Associates plans to gather additional feedback from Assessment grant awardees at the September 2008 IACTE conference as well as interview on what has (or has not) worked in terms of implementing their assessment systems. Finally, the evaluation team hopes to conduct interviews with members of the Dispositions Team to discuss the validation process as well as the dissemination of the assessment tools.

**Evaluation Plans for the Collaborative Plus Team.** For the upcoming November Interim report, the evaluation team plans to conduct document reviews of the action plans created as a result of the January 2008 workshop. Additionally, the team hopes to collect data at the October 2008 summit.

## References

- Brown-Sims, M., Rowland, C., & Sexton, S. (2006). *Iowa teacher quality enhancement grant: Interim report*. Naperville, IL: Learning Point Associates.
- Brown-Sims, M., Rowland, C., Sexton, S., & Smith, K. (2007). *Iowa teacher quality enhancement grant: Year 1 final report*. Naperville, IL: Learning Point Associates. Retrieved August 27, 2008, from <http://www.iowa.gov/educate/content/view/1046/1163/>
- Brown-Sims, M., Rowland, C., & Smith, K. (2007). *Iowa teacher quality enhancement grant: Interim report*. Naperville, IL: Learning Point Associates.
- Brown-Sims, M., Rowland, C., & Smith, K. (2008). *Iowa Teacher Quality Enhancement (TQE) Grant's Collaborative Plus Team workshop survey results. Experts learning and sharing: Meeting the learning needs of all students*. Naperville, IL: Learning Point Associates.
- Max, J., Brown-Sims, M., & Rowland, C. (2008). *Supports and barriers in the transfer of community college courses to teacher education programs in Iowa*. Naperville, IL: Learning Point Associates.
- Patton, M. Q. (1990). *Qualitative evaluation and research methods* (2nd ed.). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- State of Iowa Board of Education Examiners. (2007a). *ARC 6103B: Educational Examiners Board [282]: Notice of intended action*. Retrieved August 27, 2008, from [http://www.boee.iowa.gov/newrules/not\\_rl162.pdf](http://www.boee.iowa.gov/newrules/not_rl162.pdf)
- State of Iowa Board of Education Examiners. (2007b). *ARC 6102B: Educational Examiners Board [282]: Notice of intended action*. Retrieved August 27, 2008, from [http://www.boee.iowa.gov/newrules/not\\_rl163.pdf](http://www.boee.iowa.gov/newrules/not_rl163.pdf)



## Appendix A

### Additional State-Level Initiatives Supported by the TQE Grant

Below are descriptions of three state-level initiatives that are supported by the Teacher Quality Enhancement Grant but that are not part of the Learning Point Associates evaluation.

- **Iowa Department of Education Student Teacher Evaluation (IDESTE).** The objective of the IDESTE pilot is to provide a standardized statewide measure of student teachers in order to meet the U. S. Department of Education requirements for highly qualified new teachers under the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) law. The IDESTE currently is not required by the Iowa Department of Education but is used by several teacher preparation programs in the state. Two forms, elementary and secondary, are provided.
- **Alternative Assessment for Content Knowledge of Elementary Education Teacher Candidates.** A grant-supported task force is creating and piloting an alternative content assessment system for elementary education majors that meets the federal content knowledge requirements of the NCLB law. When the pilot is complete, the task force will provide a recommendation to the Iowa Department of Education.
- **Statewide Mentoring and Induction Team.** Iowa's TQE grant supports the statewide Mentoring and Induction Team, which gives guidance to the Iowa Department of Education on issues related to the mentoring and induction of new teachers and contributes to the overall mentoring and induction initiative in the state of Iowa. The team also plans and coordinates the Iowa Mentoring and Induction Institute held every spring.

## **Appendix B**

### **Data Collection Methodology and Sources**

#### **Interviews**

The Learning Point Associates evaluation team conducted 12 telephone interviews across two of the TQE teams and including the grant director. The team attempted to interview individuals about the Cross-Institutional Articulation Team's goal to create a statewide agreement on basic competency testing to enter teacher education programs, but not enough interviewees were found to garner meaningful information.

The evaluation team purposefully selected stakeholders for potential interviews, and the final number in Table A-1 is the result of those who agreed to be interviewed. The main goal of the interviews was to determine the extent to which the Assessment and Dispositions Teams are meeting specific team goals and objectives as well as the grant's overall goals.

The evaluation team used two different protocols to conduct the interviews, which can be found in Appendixes B and C. The different protocols were used in order to interview stakeholders about team activities and objectives that were relevant to their specific experiences. Table A-1 lists the groups that were interviewed and the number of interviews conducted for each group.

**Table B-1. Interviews Conducted by the Evaluation Team**

<b>Team</b>	<b>Number of Interviews</b>
Assessment Team grant awardees	4
Dispositions Team pilot professors	7
Iowa TQE Grant Director	1
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>12</b>

Information gathered from the interviews can be found in the Evaluation Findings section of this report.

#### **Dispositions Survey**

Between April 2, 2008, and April 23, 2008, the evaluation team conducted an online survey of teacher education students who participated in the fall 2007 or spring 2008 Dispositions Team pilots. The Dispositions Team developed a tool for assessing ethical and professional behaviors (dispositions) of teacher candidates. Seven colleges piloted this tool in fall 2007, and six colleges piloted the tool in spring 2008. The survey was administered to a small sample of students enrolled at two different institutions to ascertain their perspectives on the utility of the assessment tool as well as their participation in the pilot. The survey consisted of several multiple-choice, Likert-scaled, and open-ended questions that asked participants about their ability to identify certain dispositions within themselves, the frequency with which they used the assessment tool, the forum in which they used the tools (such as self-assessment or an introductory level course), as well as strengths and weaknesses of the tool.

The 22-item survey was created using Zoomerang, an online survey software package. A copy of the survey protocol can be found in Appendix D. Through e-mail, the evaluation team disseminated the survey link to 16 teacher education students who participated in the pilot and were preidentified by members of the Dispositions Team. Respondents received two follow-up e-mails to remind and encourage students to complete the survey. Of the initial 16, only half ( $N = 8$ ) of the students completed the survey. Because the Dispositions Team did not require faculty members to collect the names and contact information from the teacher education students who participated in the pilots, it was difficult for the evaluation team to identify and contact those students. The grant cochairs of the Dispositions Team participated in each of the pilots and kept records of their students, so the evaluation team requested the names and contact information for those teacher education participants.

Because of the small size of the sample and because this population was tapped for its convenience, the results of this survey are not generalizable to all students who took part in both the fall and spring pilot. These survey results provide only a snapshot of teacher education students' views of the assessment tool pilot. Findings from this survey can be used to provide insight to the Dispositions Team as it makes adjustments to the assessment tool following the pilot process.

## **Appendix C**

### **Interview Protocol for Assessment System Awardees From Two- and Four-Year Colleges**

#### **Background**

1. Please tell me your current title and position. How long have you been in your role?
2. Is your institution a community college, Regents university, or four-year institution?
3. How many times has your institution applied for assessment funds? How many times has your institution been awarded funds, and what is the total amount to date that has been awarded?
4. How have these additional funds been used?
5. What has been your role in terms of your assessment work?
6. Is your institution collaborating with an outside institution or another department within your school as part of this work? If yes, with whom, and what is their role? Have the key participants changed since your institution was first awarded funding?

#### **Status of Current Assessment Work**

7. Can you describe the work completed to date in the improvement of your assessment of education students who will be transferring to four-year programs?
  - a. *Probe: How, if at all, has this assessment system changed since you were first awarded funding?*
  - b. *Probe: If change has occurred, what brought about the change?*
  - c. *Probe: How specifically has this year's funding helped to improve or change what you have been doing?*
8. Besides funding, are there examples of factors that have facilitated your work since you started working on this initiative?
9. Presently, what is the timeline for this work? Specifically, at what stage in your timeline is your school currently in terms of implementation and sustainability?
10. How satisfied are you with your progress to date?
11. What have been the major accomplishments of your work to date?
12. Please explain any challenges or setbacks you have encountered since you were awarded these funds.

### **Use of Data**

13. How has your assessment work to date improved assessment of important student outcomes to date?
14. Do you currently receive feedback from any four-year institutions regarding the performance of your graduates?
15. Do you feel that your revised course assessments will enhance the transfer of your students?

### **Issues of Sustainability**

16. Has your institution begun to think about or discuss how this initiative will be sustained after the grant ends?
  - a. *Probe:* Do you have plans to continue dialogue and articulation with four-year partner institutions?
17. In your opinion, do you think your assessment of important student outcomes will be sustained after the funding has ended?
18. In your opinion, what other support mechanisms, if any, are needed to help your institution achieve its implementation goal? What about the issue of sustainability?
19. Has your institution consulted with the Assessment Team's team lead—Barry Wilson—to receive technical assistance?
  - a. *Probe:* If yes, what type of assistance was needed, and how was the problem/issue resolved?
  - b. *If no, do you plan on doing so in the future?*

### **Moving Forward**

20. In your opinion, what were the greatest accomplishments made in 2007 in terms of this work?
21. For this upcoming 2008–2009 year, and keeping in mind this work, please identify at least one or two goals your institution hopes to accomplish.
22. Is there anything else that you can tell us that will help us understand in more depth the changes and improvements made to implement or sustain your data collection and management system?

## **Appendix D**

### **Interview Protocol for Dispositions Team**

### **Fall 2007 and Spring 2008 Pilots**

1. Please describe your current position. How long you have you been in that role?
  - a. *Probe: Do you work with teacher education students?*
2. How did you get involved with the work of the Dispositions Team? How did you get involved with the fall 2007 pilot?
  - a. *Probe: How did you hear about the pilot; how was your participation solicited?*
3. How many other professors, if any, in your department or at your university participated in the fall 2007 pilot?
4. Describe any instructions you received from the Dispositions Team on how to implement the assessment tool.
  - a. *Probe: Would more or different kinds of instructions have been useful?*
5. During what part of the preservice teachers' program did you use the assessment tool (e.g. coursework or field experience)?
  - a. *Probe: If it was coursework, which course was it, and why was that particular course chosen?*
  - b. *Probe: If it was during field experience, why was that chosen?*
6. How was the assessment tool implemented?
  - a. *Probe: Who was assessed? How often?*
7. In your opinion, do you think the tool comprehensively assesses the multiple ethical and professional behaviors exhibited by student teachers?
8. Have you received feedback from your colleagues or students about the utility or feasibility of the tool? If so, please briefly describe that feedback.
9. Can you identify one or two strengths of the tool? What about weaknesses?
10. In your opinion, how can the tool be improved?
11. Universities already are required to assess preservice teachers' dispositions. Compare the conceptual framework and the assessment tool that you used in the pilot with any already used methods of assessing preservice teachers' dispositions.
12. Do you think other Iowa institutions will use this tool to *assess* their teacher education students? If so, how do you think that will take place?
  - a. *Probe: What will they do with the data? How will they use the data?*
13. Do you think other Iowa institutions and preservice teachers will use the information from this tool as a *method for continuous learning and improvement*? If so, how do you think this will take place?
14. Is there anything else that you would like to share?

## Appendix E

### Survey Protocol for Students Participating in the Fall 2007 and/or Spring 2008 Dispositions Pilots

1. In the **fall 2007** or **spring 2008** semesters, did you participate in the piloting of a tool that assessed the dispositional qualities of teacher education candidates?
  - a. Yes
  - b. No
2. During which semester did you participate?
  - a. Fall 2007
  - b. Spring 2008
3. Was the assessment tool administered during your field experience?
  - a. Yes
  - b. No
4. For what level did you use the assessment tool? *Select all that apply.*
  - a. Introductory course
  - b. Midlevel course
  - c. Advanced or methods course
  - d. Theory course
  - e. Other. \_\_\_\_\_ (*Please specify.*)
5. During the pilot, how did you apply the assessment tool? *Select all that apply.*
  - a. I used the tool as a self-assessment.
  - b. I used the tool to observe a teacher or my professor in the classroom.
  - c. I used the tool during my field experience.
  - d. I used the tool during my student teaching.
  - e. I used the tool to observe my preservice peer(s).
  - f. Other. \_\_\_\_\_ (*Please specify.*)
6. Over the course of the pilot, how often did you use the assessment tool?
  - a. One time during the course of the pilot.
  - b. Two times during the course of the pilot.
  - c. Three times during the course of the pilot.
  - d. Four or more times during the course of the pilot.
  - e. I did not use the assessment tool.

7. Was the *purpose* of the assessment tool clearly explained to you?
  - a. Yes
  - b. No
8. Were clear instructions given on how to use the assessment tool?
  - a. Yes
  - b. No
9. If no, what could have been done to make the instructions more clear? (*Open-ended*)
10. Rate the degree of ease in using the assessment tool.
  - a. Very difficult
  - b. Somewhat difficult
  - c. Somewhat easy
  - d. Very easy

**Dispositions are described as the ethical and professional behaviors exhibited by an individual.** The following questions will ask about your ability to *identify* these various behaviors.

11. How easy or difficult did you find it to identify the following set of **caring** related dispositions *within yourself* while using the assessment tool?

Rate the degree of ease in identifying the following set of <b>caring</b> dispositions <i>within yourself</i> .	<b>Very Difficult</b>	<b>Somewhat Difficult</b>	<b>Somewhat Easy</b>	<b>Very Easy</b>	<b>I Did Not Assess Myself on This Disposition</b>	<b>Not Applicable</b>
<b>Empathy</b>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<b>Compassion</b>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<b>Rapport</b>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<b>Respect</b>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<b>Passion</b>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<b>Cultural competence</b>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>



12. How easy or difficult did you find it to identify the following set of **communication** related dispositions *within yourself* while using the assessment tool?

Rate the degree of ease in identifying the following set of <b>communication</b> dispositions <i>within yourself</i> .	<b>Very Difficult</b>	<b>Somewhat Difficult</b>	<b>Somewhat Easy</b>	<b>Very Easy</b>	<b>I Did Not Assess Myself on This Disposition</b>	<b>Not Applicable</b>
<b>Presence</b>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<b>Responsiveness</b>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<b>Attentiveness</b>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<b>Authenticity</b>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<b>Collaborativeness</b>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<b>Voice</b>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

13. How easy or difficult did you find it to identify the following set of **critical** related dispositions *within yourself* while using the assessment tool?

Rate the degree of ease in identifying the following set of <b>critical</b> dispositions <i>within yourself</i> .	<b>Very Difficult</b>	<b>Somewhat Difficult</b>	<b>Somewhat Easy</b>	<b>Very Easy</b>	<b>I Did Not Assess Myself on This Disposition</b>	<b>Not Applicable</b>
<b>Reflectiveness</b>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<b>Initiative</b>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<b>Open-mindedness</b>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<b>Efficacy</b>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<b>Humility</b>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

14. How easy or difficult did you find it to identify the following set of **creative** related dispositions *within yourself* while using the assessment tool?

Rate the degree of ease in identifying the following set of <b>creative</b> dispositions <i>within yourself</i> .	<b>Very Difficult</b>	<b>Somewhat Difficult</b>	<b>Somewhat Easy</b>	<b>Very Easy</b>	<b>I Did Not Assess Myself on This Disposition</b>	<b>Not Applicable</b>
<b>Flexibility</b>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<b>Inventiveness</b>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<b>Resourcefulness</b>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<b>Respect</b>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<b>Passion</b>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<b>Cultural competence</b>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

15. How easy or difficult did you find it to identify the following set of **professional requirements** *within yourself* while using the assessment tool?

Rate the degree of ease in identifying the following set of <b>professional requirements</b> <i>within yourself</i> .	<b>Very Difficult</b>	<b>Somewhat Difficult</b>	<b>Somewhat Easy</b>	<b>Very Easy</b>	<b>I Did Not Assess Myself on This Disposition</b>	<b>Not Applicable</b>
<b>Professionalism</b>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<b>Personal and professional ethics and integrity</b>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<b>Work ethic/responsibility</b>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<b>Confidentiality</b>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

16. Overall, how effective was the assessment tool in capturing the different ethical and professional behaviors that should be exhibited by teachers?

- Very ineffective
- Somewhat ineffective
- Effective
- Very effective

17. Overall, how useful is the assessment tool as a method for continuous learning to become a better teacher for all students?
- a. Not at all useful
  - b. Minimally useful
  - c. Moderately useful
  - d. Very useful
18. Identify **two strengths** of the assessment tool.
- a. **Strength 1:** \_\_\_\_\_
  - b. **Strength 2:** \_\_\_\_\_
19. Identify **two weaknesses** of the assessment tool.
- a. **Weakness 1:** \_\_\_\_\_
  - b. **Weakness 2:** \_\_\_\_\_
20. Which type of institution are you affiliated with?
- a. Community college
  - b. Regents university
  - c. Four-year institution
21. Which school do you currently attend?
- a. Faith Bible College
  - b. Iowa State University
  - c. Kirkwood Community College
  - d. North Iowa Community College
  - e. Simpson College
  - f. University of Iowa
  - g. University of Northern Iowa
  - h. Other. \_\_\_\_\_ (*Please specify.*)
22. What is your current classification at your institution?
- a. Freshman
  - b. Sophomore
  - c. Junior
  - d. Senior
  - e. Graduate student
  - f. Other. \_\_\_\_\_ (*Please specify.*)

## Appendix F

### Document Review Rubric

#### Scoring Rubric

<p style="text-align: center;">—2—</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Extensive Coverage</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Information is clearly articulated, apparent, and easily located within the document.</li><li>• Information provided within the document sufficiently addresses the targeted indicator under this thematic area.</li></ul>
<p style="text-align: center;">—1—</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Minimal Coverage</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Information is not directly apparent within the document.</li><li>• Information inadequately addresses the targeted indicator under this thematic area.</li></ul>
<p style="text-align: center;">—0—</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>No Coverage</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There appears to be no coverage of required information in the document that addresses the targeted indicator under this thematic area.</li></ul>

## Communication

Indicator	Rating	Document Number(s)	Page Number(s)	Notes
The expressed purpose of the document reflects Iowa Teacher Quality Enhancement Grant goal(s). These are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Strengthen teaching in the content areas.</li> <li>Improve teaching for diverse populations.</li> <li>Reform improvement through analysis.</li> <li>Meet future challenges through collaboration.</li> </ul>				
Clearly establishes TQE team goals or objectives.				
States clearly and precisely the purpose of the document.				
Document content and language is directed toward key stakeholders.				
Clear deadlines are articulated.				
<b>OVERALL RATING (Sum of Item 1 through Item 5) (Range 0–10):</b>				

## Establishing Partnerships

Indicator	Rating	Document Number(s)	Page Number(s)	Notes
Specifically identifies institutions of higher education, administrators, or other key stakeholders as support mechanisms in achieving team goals or objectives.				
States clearly and precisely the intent, goals, or expectations for the partnership.				
States clearly and precisely if there are any consequences for breaking the contract, agreement, or partnership.				
<b>OVERALL RATING (Sum of Item 1 through Item 3) (Range 0–6):</b>				

## Practical/Feasible Implementation

Indicator	Rating	Document Number(s)	Page Number(s)	Notes
Document provides detailed policy background or context.				
Gives detailed description of initiatives/activities.				
Sets clear guidelines as to how and when details of the document will be implemented (funding, reporting—e.g., request for proposal).				
Establishes guidelines for how to use or implement suggested policies, practices, initiatives, or activities (implementing product—e.g., Iowa Department of Education Student Teacher Evaluation).				
There is a focus on sound educational research and practice.				
Has a clearly defined plan to utilize respondent feedback results, such as guidelines for reviewing or evaluating work.				
<b>OVERALL RATING (Sum of Item 1 through Item 6) (Range 0–12):</b>				

## Strengthen Teaching in the Content Areas

Indicator	Rating	Document Number(s)	Page Number(s)	Notes
Clearly defined strategies for building both content knowledge and pedagogical knowledge in mathematics, reading, writing, and science.				
Has a focus on curriculum alignment with national/state/district standards or performance indicators.				
<b>OVERALL RATING (Sum of Item 1 through Item 2) (Range 0–4):</b>				

## Reform Teacher Education Programs Through Analysis of Candidates and Program Performance Data

Indicator	Rating	Document Number(s)	Page Number(s)	Notes
Clearly identifies which competencies, practices, courses, policies, or procedures need to be taught, assessed, or monitored.				
States specific minimum and/or maximum cutoff or acceptance criteria (i.e., cutoff scores; grade point average, or course credits).				
Establishes guidelines for reporting data on teacher candidates.				
Establishes clear strategies to help in the development of teacher educators.				
<b>OVERALL RATING (Sum of Item 1 through Item 4) (Range 0–8):</b>				

## Raises Standards and/or Accountability for Institutions of Higher Education, Administrators, Students, or Teachers

Indicator	Rating	Document Number(s)	Page Number(s)	Notes
Requires clearly defined formative or summative strategies for tracking the effectiveness of work.				
<b>OVERALL RATING (Sum of Item 1) (Range 0–2):</b>				

## Professional Development

Indicator	Rating	Document Number(s)	Page Number(s)	Notes
Components of professional development are clearly aligned with state and national standards.				
Learning activities are clearly described and are relevant and rigorous.				
Establishes guidelines or strategies for ensuring that professional development translates into effective classroom strategies.				
<b>OVERALL RATING (Sum of Item 1 through Item 3) (Range 0–6):</b>				

## Assessment

Indicator	Rating	Document Number(s)	Page Number(s)	Notes
Uses clearly defined strategies to evaluate and monitor the effectiveness of teacher education programs.				
Utilizes various tools (such as assessments or rubrics) to monitor the success of policies, programs, or initiatives.				
Makes use of multiple assessments for diagnostic and reteaching purposes.				
<b>OVERALL RATING (Sum of Item 1 through Item 3) (Range 0–6):</b>				